UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,793	04/20/2004	Edwin C. Iliff	HEWAYS.015A6D1	5083
20995 7590 05/04/2010 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET			EXAMINER	
			ZHOU, SHUBO	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com efiling@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/828,793	ILIFF, EDWIN C.			
Examiner-indated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631			
All Participants:	Status of Application:				
(1) <u>SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU</u> .	(3) <u>Liberty Mann</u> .				
(2) <u>Raimond Salenieks</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 23 April 2010	Time:				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 103(a)					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed: Peifer et al. with regard to encapsulation of data to hide therefor					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:					
Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.					
/SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Peifer et al. was discussed in relation to the motivation of encapsulation of data so as to have it hidden. It is agreed that the "encapsulation" described in Peifer does not hide the data being encapsulated. Peifer describes that digital video, voice, and medical measurement data is encapsulated in packets and sent over a network. Peifer describes that data such as medical measurement data may be parsed among several packets, and that each packet will include not only the parsed data, but also a field indicating the destination of the packet. Placing the data into packets in this way allows the data to be transmitted between networks. Therefore, "encapsulating" the data in packets as described in Peifer will not hide the data. Thus, it is agreed that the rejection under 103(a) should be withdrawn. The examiner acknowledged that the prosecution on the merits of the application would be reopened and an action would follow soon.